

REMARKS

In the foregoing amendment, applicants have cancelled the claims that have been rejected over Bassam U.S. Patent No. 5,849,264 and Stopper U.S. Patent No. 4,536,323. In addition, applicants have denoted the subgenera of component (d) by roman numerals, in order to avoid confusion with components (a), (b), (c) and (d); at the same time, applicants are correcting some typographical errors. In amending these paragraphs, applicants are using the paragraph numbers in their original specification. The corresponding paragraph numbers in Patent Publication No. US 2003/0096878A1 are 0047-0053.

Claims 17-24, in amended form, remain in this application and have been rejected as anticipated by PCT Publication WO99/21659 ("Fox"). Reconsideration of this rejection as applied to Claims 17-24 is requested and applicants further submit that the rejection would not be applicable to newly presented Claims 25-36.

Applicants and the examiner agree that Fox discloses a device that imparts a charge to liquid droplets solely by the interaction between the liquid and the aerosol device. What the examiner apparently fails to recognize, however, is that the methods claimed by applicants in Claims 17-19 and 25-36 are directed to methods for enhancing the charge imparted to such droplets by means of careful choice in the components of the composition to be discharged. As stated by applicants in paragraph 0008 of the written description,

[B]y careful selection of the components which are to be contained within a liquid composition for application by aerosol spraying, it is possible to charge the liquid droplets during the spraying operation without requiring any special features of the construction of the aerosol spraying head.

Fox requires -- as stated at page 2, lines 22-31 -- that, during the spraying of the liquid droplets from the aerosol device, there must be imparted to the droplets a unipolar charge having a specified charge to mass ratio. Although this specified charge to mass ratio can be used in applicants' claimed methods, as in Claims 34 and 35 of this application, there is no requirement that this charge to mass ratio -- or, for that matter, any specific charge to mass ratio -- be imparted to the droplets as a result of the configuration of the aerosol device. Thus, by careful selection of the components in the aerosol composition, the droplets of the liquid are

electrostatically charged without requiring any specific interaction between the liquid composition and the device. Fox clearly does not disclose the methods of applicants' Claims 17-19 or 25-36.

Claim 20 is directed to a method for enhancing the electrostatic charge imparted to droplets which involves a specific process for preparing the composition to be discharged from an aerosol spray device. This process is not disclosed by Fox.


Claims 21-24 are directed to another aspect of applicants' invention. These claims require differences in the surface energies either (a) between a Lewis base component of the composition and the Lewis base component of the material that the composition comes into contact with upon spraying, or (b) between a Lewis acid component of the composition and the Lewis acid component of the material with which the composition comes into contact upon spraying. The formulation of the composition and the formulation of the portion of the aerosol spray device coming in contact with the composition are chosen so that these differences are met. Since the electrical charge provided in accordance with the Fox reference is derived solely by interaction between the liquid and aerosol spray device, Fox does not anticipate these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and these remarks, it is believed that all claims now in this application are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3 November 2004



Frederick H. Rabin
Reg. No. 24,488

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906